



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,774	01/03/2002	Arch D. Robison	42390P13132	7002

8791 7590 11/03/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

FOWLKES, ANDRE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/037,774	ROBISON, ARCH D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andre R. Fowlkes	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/18/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper, et al., (Cooper), "Enhanced Code Compression for Embedded RISC Processors", SIGPLAN '99, in view of Damron et al., (Damron), U.S. Patent No. 6,918,111 (art made of record).

As per claim 1, Cooper discloses a method comprising:

- **identifying a plurality of fork subgraph structures within a graph structure constructed for a plurality of executable instructions** (p. 143 col. R:23-24, "we first

use the interference graph to (identify a plurality of fork subgraph structures with in a graph structure constructed for a plurality of executable instructions)),

- identifying a plurality of unifiable variables within each fork subgraph structure of said plurality of fork subgraph structures, which are not simultaneously used in said plurality of executable instructions (p. 140 col. L:8-9, "our compression framework first identifies repeats (i.e. unifiable variables/instructions)", and p. 140 col. R:38-39, "the compiler must analyze them to identify any conditions that would inhibit the transformation (i.e. the unifiable variables/instructions that are not used simultaneously are identified for optimization)"),

- identifying at least one unifiable instruction of said plurality of executable instructions, within said plurality of fork subgraph structures (p. 140 col. R:38-39, "the compiler must analyze them to identify any conditions that would inhibit the transformation (i.e. the unifiable variables/instructions that are not used simultaneously are identified for optimization)"),

- transferring at least one unifiable instruction of said plurality of executable instructions from a fork of a corresponding fork subgraph structure of said plurality of fork subgraph structures to a handle of said corresponding fork subgraph structure (p. 141 col. R:27-29, "identical regions (unifiable instructions from a fork) that end with a jump to the same target are merged together (in the handle)"),

- said at least one unifiable instruction containing at least one unifiable variable of said plurality of unifiable variables (p. 140 col. L:8-9, "our compression framework first identifies repeats (i.e. unifiable variables/instructions)").

Cooper doesn't explicitly disclose **constructing a dependence graph of said plurality of executable instructions and using said dependence graph to optimize code execution.**

However, Damron in an analogous environment, discloses **constructing a dependence graph of said plurality of executable instructions and using said dependence graph to optimize code execution** (col. 4:60-65, "As is well known in the art dependency graph, and in particular directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), are commonly used to map or graph dependencies between instructions. Dependency graph have been used in the past to help optimize instruction scheduling for processor pipelines, or processors with multiple execution units").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Damron into the system of Cooper to have **constructing a dependence graph of said plurality of executable instructions and using said dependence graph to optimize code execution.** The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have wanted to use the well known and well document dependence graph to efficiently locate sections of code that are ideal for optimization.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Cooper discloses that identifying said plurality of unifiable variables further comprises:

- **constructing an interference graph structure for a plurality of local variables within said each fork subgraph structure** (p. 143 col. R:23-24, “we first (construct and) use the interference graph),

- **said plurality of local variables including said plurality of unifiable variables** (p. 140 col. L:8-9, “our compression framework first identifies repeats (i.e. unifiable variables/instructions)”)),

- **identifying said plurality of unifiable variables as variables having non-overlapping live ranges within said interference graph structure** (p. 143 figure 8, Live range analysis, and associated text (e.g. p. 143 col. L:34 – p. 144 col. R:42)).

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further, Cooper discloses that **said interference graph structure indicates which variables of said plurality of local variables are simultaneously used in said plurality of executable instructions and cannot be unified** (p. 143 figure 8, Live range analysis, and associated text (e.g. p. 143 col. L:34 – p. 144 col. R:42), and p. 140 col. R:38-39, “the compiler must analyze them to identify any conditions that would inhibit the transformation (i.e. the unifiable variables/instructions that are not used simultaneously are identified for optimization)”)).

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Cooper discloses that identifying said plurality of unifiable variables further comprises: **constructing a data dependence analysis for said plurality of executable**

instructions; and identifying said plurality of unifiable variables using said data dependence analysis (p. 148 col. L:57-58, "(unifiable variables are identified) subject to (data) dependence constraints").

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Cooper discloses **initializing a flag for said at least one unifiable instruction; and unifying each unifiable variable within said at least one unifiable instruction** (p. 140 col. L:8-9, "our compression framework first identifies (i.e. flags) repeats (i.e. unifiable variables/instructions)", and p. 141 col. R:27-29, "identical regions (unifiable instructions from a fork) that end with a jump to the same target are merged together (in the handle)").

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further, Cooper discloses **removing said at least one unifiable instruction from subsequent forks of said corresponding fork subgraph structure** (p. 141 col. R:27-29, "identical regions (i.e. unifiable instructions) that end with a jump to the same target (are removed from a fork) are merged together (in the handle)").

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further, Cooper discloses that **said data dependence analysis contains a plurality of dependence arcs, each dependence arc connecting two instructions of said plurality of executable instructions contained within said fork of said corresponding fork**

subgraph structure (p. 148 col. L:57-58, "(unifiable variables are identified) subject to (data) dependence constraints").

As per claims 8-14, this is a system version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims 1-7, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see Cooper method of enhanced code compression for embedded RISC processors, p. 140 col. L:7-18 and Figs. 3 & 4, and the Damron system, col. 4:60-65.

As per claims 15-21, this is a computer readable medium version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims 1-7, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see Cooper method of enhanced code compression for embedded RISC processors, p. 140 col. L:7-18 and Figs. 3 & 4, and the Damron system, col. 4:60-65.

As per claims 22-28, this is another system version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims 1-7, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see Cooper method of enhanced code compression for embedded RISC processors, p. 140 col. L:7-18 and Figs. 3 & 4, and the Damron system, col. 4:60-65.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2192

4. Applicants arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

- 1) The cited art does not disclose the newly added features of presently amended claims 1, 8, 15 & 22, at p. 16:20-18:4.

Examiner's response:

- 1) In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show the new limitations of the presently amended claims, it is noted that the newly added limitations upon which applicant relies are fully addressed in the above art rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre R. Fowlkes whose telephone number is (571) 272-3697. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571)272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2192

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

ARF